Case 1:16-cv-01599-GHW-AJP Document 145 Filed 04/12/17 Page 1 of 12 1 H39VBACC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 ORRIN BACOTE, 4 Plaintiff, 5 16 CV 1599 (GHW) V. 6 RIVERBAY CORPORATION, ET AL, 7 Defendants. TELEPHONE CONFERENCE 8 New York, N.Y. 9 March 9, 2017 4:37 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. GREGORY H. WOODS, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 COHEN & FITCH 15 Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: GERALD M. COHEN ILYSSA S. FUCHS 16 17 ARMIENTI DEBELLIS GUGLIELMO & RHODEN Attorneys for Defendants 18 BY: HORACE O. K. RHODEN SHANTAE JOHNSON 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 (In chambers) THE COURT: This is Judge Woods. 2 3 Do I have counsel for plaintiff on the line? 4 MR. COHEN: Yes, your Honor. 5 Gerald Cohen. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. 7 I'm also here with Ilyssa Fuchs, who just MR. COHEN: walked in. 8 9 THE COURT: Thank you. 10 Do I have counsel for defendants on the line? 11 MR. RHODEN: Yes, your Honor. 12 Horace Rhoden. 13 Also with me is Shantae Johnson. Ms. Johnson will not 14 be speaking at this conference, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon. So I scheduled this conference to discuss the letter 16 17 submitted regarding a potential motion to compel the disclosure of grand jury minutes related to plaintiff's underlying 18 19 criminal proceedings. 20 As we all know, I previously rejected plaintiff's 21 request to make a motion to -- for me to compel the disclosure 2.2 of those records on the basis of the then-existing case 23 management plan. I invited Mr. Cohen to make an application 24 with respect to that if he wished to after I granted defendants

their request to conduct expert discovery following the

25

deadline previously set for completion of expert discovery which resulted in an unfortunate, but necessary, adjournment of the summary judgment briefing schedule.

I reviewed the letter from the parties. I'd like to give each of you the opportunity to discuss your positions regarding the request and, if you'd like, the anticipated motion.

I'll turn to each of you in order, beginning with you, Mr. Cohen.

MR. COHEN: Yes, your Honor.

I think the letter pretty much says what our position is. We think that the minutes here would be very, very instructive, especially in light of defendant's new employ of an expert.

The only record closest in time to the events that exist for many -- the first-party accounts for many of the witnesses is the grand jury minutes. There are several different views of the mechanism of injury for Officer Catala, what happened on that evening. I think the plaintiff -- one of the main claims here -- a lot of the claims revolve around whether they are telling the truth. Since the story has changed over time or I believe the story has changed over time, at least from one witness to the other, I think the grand jury minutes will help plaintiff more fully show how the story from a first-party account has changed from each of the witnesses.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Now, can you sketch out for me, please, Mr. Cohen, how you would view the briefing process for this motion to play out if I grant it, understanding that I remain, as I was when you first raised this request, concerned about keeping the schedule in place.

The current schedule would have expert discovery completed by April 19th, and the defendant's partial motion for summary judgment being filed by May 10th.

My preference, were I to grant this motion, would be to be in a position to have decided on it and to permit sufficient time for the state to provide the information in a schedule so that the information that's produced could be used in connection with the May 10, 2017 partial summary judgment motion.

So with those parameters, can you tell me how you view the process working out in the event that I grant you the relief that you requested.

MR. COHEN: So, your Honor, I think we can -- we've written at length about this issue.

We can quickly turn around a motion within two weeks and give the relevant parties two weeks to respond. If a reply is necessary at all, we would need no more than a week. And that would bring us to about five weeks from today, which is, what, in middle April maybe?

THE COURT: Thank you.

You say two weeks for the relevant parties to respond.

Are you referring, in part, I assume, to the state; is that

correct?

MR. COHEN: I think we would need to serve it upon the district attorney's office. They've already prepared a motion in state court. I don't expect that motion to be very different from what their opposition was. It was actually a very general, broad motion about the particular interests in this case about keeping grand jury minutes. I think it was only like two or three pages in state court, if I'm not mistaken. I expect a very similar response from them.

Again, it's not something that -- it's not an issue that the parties -- all the parties in this case haven't already thought about and written about. So we're not talking about recreating from an issue that hasn't been considered and reviewed and researched.

So two weeks for us to provide something; two weeks for Mr. Rhoden and the district attorney's office to provide their opposition; and maybe a week for a reply. I don't know how your Honor feels about that. If you want to even shorten it, we can scramble and make it shorter. We're okay with that. We're amenable to that. We just think we would like a fair shot for your Honor to look at these issues and see if these minutes could be used for this case.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. Let me ask, do you have a human being in particular 2 3 who you understand to be responsible for this case at the 4 district attorney's office? 5 MR. COHEN: The ADA that actually responded over there has left. 6 7 Hold on. My associate has been in touch with them, so I'm going 8 9 to ask her to give the Court information on that. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Fuchs? 11 12 MS. FUCHS: Yes. 13 So the ADA who was working on it was an ADA Juan. Ι 14 have been informed that he has since either left the DA's 15 office entirely or changed departments. The person who has taken over his position is now an 16 17 ADA Felicia Yancy. I don't know for sure that she would be the 18 party responding, but I would presume, based on prior conversations with her in regards to getting the DA file, that 19 20 she would be the relevant point person for the motion. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. Good. 22 Is there anything else that you'd like to say in 23 support of your request, counsel for plaintiff? 24 MR. COHEN: No, your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT:

25

Let me turn to counsel for defendants.

What's your view regarding the request? I welcome any comments regarding anything related to the request that you'd like to bring to my attention.

MR. RHODEN: Yes.

Just briefly, your Honor. And we do stand on the papers that we have submitted to the Court.

We just note, first, that what is being requested here is different; he is, in essence, requesting a reopening of the fact discovery. What your Honor has granted us recently is an extension of the expert discovery, which we believe is different.

On this case, if your Honor should grant this request and the grand jury minutes are sealed, we solely agree with your Honor that this will definitely affect our summary judgment motion.

We believe although that it should not be given.

Counsel indicated that the reason why he wants the grand jury minutes is because it's the only evidence that he has that is closest in time to the accident, which is not true at all. Counsel has the videotape, which is taken at the time of the accident. He can certainly use the videotape if he so desires to impeach the witnesses. That's really the issue here; that's what he really wants, is to impeach these officers. The videotape can be used to impeach the officers.

He has the reports, the police report. That can certainly be used to impeach the officers. And he has the deposition testimony, deposition testimony of nine officers. He certainly can use that to impeach the officers. He certainly does not need the transcript, the transcript of the grand jury testimony.

We believe that the Court's order in the state court was well-reasoned as to why the grand jury testimony is not needed in this case, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So I've considered the arguments that the parties raised in your joint letter, and I have listened intently to the arguments here now.

Let me say that I would very much like to be able to hold to my original decision, but I don't think that it is justified under these circumstances.

The principal driver for my decision earlier not to allow plaintiff to make this motion was that it fell outside of the fact discovery window and that, as a consequence, pursuing this additional discovery would cause us to deviate from the remainder of the schedule, including completion of expert discovery and the summary judgment motion. Had I granted leave for filing of this additional motion at the time, it would have required a modification of those scheduling orders, dates for subsequent steps in the case, particularly, in my mind, the

deadline for the motion for summary judgment.

As a result of the defendants' request for me to reopen or open expert discovery to accommodate the expert that they most recently disclosed, I had to adjourn the schedule for the summary judgment motion and, as a result, the principal driver, I will call it, of my decision to adhere so firmly to the Rule 16 scheduling requirements with respect to fact discovery on this issue has simply changed. I am willing to allow plaintiff to file this motion; and I will reopen fact discovery for this extremely limited purpose, namely, the limited purpose of allowing them to seek compulsion of the grand jury minutes.

I want to say very clearly that I have not taken a sneak peek, I'll say, at the merits of this motion. I take no position now about the merits of the motion. You should imply no signal about the likelihood that I will grant the motion or deny it based on the fact that I'm allowing plaintiff to file it. I'm simply reconsidering my prior order which went to the scheduling of the case as a whole and my desire to keep the case moving apace.

Driven by that same motivation, I'd like to impose an expedited schedule for briefing of this motion, with apologies, Mr. Cohen, because I anticipate that it may take more time for the district attorney's office to respond than you anticipate.

I'm going to set a deadline for submission of the motion itself

of March 20th. Any reply I'm going to direct to be filed no later -- or, sorry, opposition I'm going to direct to be filed no later than two weeks following service of the motion. Any reply will be due no later than one week following the service of the oppositions, if any.

In the interim, I would like the plaintiffs and the defendants to -- sorry, plaintiff and the defendants to notify the district attorney's office that you anticipate that such a motion will be filed so that in the intervening time, they can identify the person or people who will be opposing the motion if they wish to oppose it. I don't want them to start from a dead stop on the date that the motion itself is filed. So I'd like for you to reach out to the district attorney's office to let them know that this is happening and to let them know that I have set a relatively short briefing schedule for their opposition.

I will also tell you that I compressed the briefing schedule for the plaintiff in order to allow additional room or, I should call it, time for the defendants and, more significantly here, from my perspective, the district attorney's office to oppose the motion. My hope is that they will be able to submit an opposition within the two weeks that I've just established. But I'm signaling now that I have curtailed the amount of time available to plaintiffs to file your motion in order to give some leeway to the district

attorney's office in the event that it will take them more time to prepare their opposition than the two weeks that I'm setting as the initial due date for their opposition.

So that is the schedule.

Again, I have no view at this point about the merits of the motion. I'll evaluate that on the basis of the parties' written submissions, which I look forward to seeing in accordance with the schedule that I've just described and which I will set forth in a written order that will be issued either later today or tomorrow.

Is there anything else for us to discuss, counsel for plaintiff?

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, I think we can figure this out logistically. My associate just brought this up. I don't know if the Court needs to know about this, how the DA's office is going to file this. They may or may not have someone who knows how to use ECF, but maybe we'll figure that out when we speak to them.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Please let me know what you're able to work out. If you need any special accommodations from the Court, please feel free to write me jointly.

MR. COHEN: Okay. That sounds good.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else from you, Mr. Rhoden?

```
H39VBACC
                MR. RHODEN: No, your Honor.
 1
                THE COURT: Good. Thank you, all.
 2
 3
                MR. RHODEN: Thank you.
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```